

# MEMOIRS OF LITERATURE.

MONDAY, December 7. 1713.

I.

REFLECTIONS upon JOHN HUS's Trial inserted in the three last Memoirs. By Mr. LENFANT, Chaplain to the King of Prussia.

**I**T is not very difficult, says Mr. Lenfant, to discover the true Cause of John Hus's Execution, and to draw his Character. The Sentence of the Council imports, that John Hus is a manifest, scandalous, obstinate, and incorrigible Heretick. As for what concerns Obstinacy, we have seen how he constantly denied that Accusation, and protested that he was ready to retract any Error, of which he should be convicted by the Holy Scripture, or plain Arguments drawn from it. Wherefore in order to condemn him as an obstinate Man, they should have proved by the Holy Scripture and good Reasons, that the Articles which he acknowledged were erroneous; and as for those which he disowned, the Council should have confronted the Witnesses in his Presence to convict him. But they were contented to alledge the Witnesses by general Denominations, and not by their own Names: Nay, when he desired to know the Name of a certain Doctor who accused him of adding a fourth Person to the Trinity, the Council

denied his Request, as has been already observed. As for what concerns his Instruction, he always complained that they refused to instruct him both in publick and in private; and that when he quoted some Passages of the Scripture in his own Defence, they would not hear him. But to shew that John Hus could not be condemned as an obstinate Man, we need only consult the Doctors about the Nature of Obstinacy. Let us hear John de Courtecuisse (Johan. Brevis Coxæ ap. Gerf. T. I. p. 839.) a Paris-Doctor, very famous in the XVth Century, and Bishop of Geneva, in the Time of the Council of Constance. He says, that whatever Error a Man may fall into, he ought not to be accounted either an Heretick, or an obstinate Man, when he shews himself ready to retract after a right Instruction. And then the same Doctor explaining what sort of Instruction ought to be given to a Man, who is in an Error, adds, that no Instruction can be said to be right and sufficient, unless they make him see his Error so plainly, that in the Judgment of intelligent Persons, he cannot deny that his Opinion is contrary to the Catholic Faith. The same Doctrine may be seen in many Places of Gerson's Works. Dicitur (says he) pertinaciter quis tenere aliquid, quando non est paratus corrigi, vel non querit cum sollicitudine veritatem. (Op. Gerf. T. II. p. 264.) Now according to this Definition of Obstinacy, 'tis certain that John Hus could not be condemned as an obstinate Man.

As for his Heresies, it is not very easy to know exactly wherein they consisted. He

Sc

ne.



never asserted the Doctrine of the *Communion in both Kinds*, (*Mr. Lenfant proves it undeniably*); and it plainly appears from his public Examination, that such a Doctrine was never objected against him. It is no less certain that he believed *Transubstantiation* and the *real Presence*. He frequently declared it in express Words, in a full Council; nay, after many Quibbles and Subtilties, they were forced to acknowledge that he was Orthodox upon the Eucharist. Besides, in a Treatise which he writ in his Confinement, concerning *the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*, he plainly says, that he always held the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, before he was a Priest; and that from the time of his being made a Priest, he taught it publicly in the Church and the University. The particular Opinions of *John Hus*, about that Matter, may therefore be reduced to these three Heads. 1. A Bohemian Preacher having asserted, that a Priest before his first Mass is only a Child of God; and that after he has officiated, he is the Father of God, and Creator of God's Body; *John Hus* writ a Treatise to confute such a strange Assertion, though it was not new; and he maintained that Christ is the Author of *Transubstantiation*, a Priest being only the Minister of it by Virtue of the Sacramental Words. 2. We have seen that the Archbishop of Prague required from *John Hus*, that he should not say, that Christ was the Bread after the Consecration. *John Hus* refused to obey that Order, and shewed by the Words of Christ and St. Paul, by the Canon of the Mass, and many Authorities of the Fathers, that before and after the Consecration Christ is always the Bread, but a heavenly, spiritual, and *super substantial* Bread. 3. Because some affirmed that the Body of Christ is seen with bodily Eyes in the Eucharist; that it is handled like other Bodies, and chewed with the Teeth; and that it goes into and comes out of the Stomach, as any other Food; *John Hus* maintained and proved by the Authority of the Doctors, that the Body of Christ is incorruptible, and that the Accidents only of the Bread and Wine are handled and chewed. And when they objected to him the Retraction of *Berengarius*, *Ego Berengarius*, importing that according to the Doctrine of the Church, the true Body of Christ is seen, handled, and eaten corporally, and not figuratively in the Eucharist; he alledged the

Gloss upon that Retraction, which says, that if the Words of that Retraction are not explained in a right Sense, and understood of the Accidents, it will be a greater Error than that of *Berengarius* himself. If what has been said, was not sufficient to shew that *John Hus* believed the Sacrifice of the Mass; his constant celebrating of it, even at Constance, and, as it were, in the Sight of the Council, would be an undeniable Proof of his Belief upon that Head. For, had he not been fully convinced of the Necessity of that Duty, or had he had the least Scruple about it, his Excommunication would have afforded him a very fair Pretence to forbear saying Mass. 'Tis true, that though he was sensible of the Excellency of the Priesthood, yet he could not bear that Priests should take too much upon themselves under such a Pretence. And therefore he severely reprov'd a Preacher, who asserted that *the most wicked Priest is better than the best Layman*.

It appears from many of his Letters, that he ascribed a great Power to the *Intercession of Saints*. In the XXIIId he prays St. Peter and St. Paul to intercede for him, that he may suffer courageously, as they did, if it be the Will of God; and in the XXXth, he begs the same Favour of St. John the Baptist. If he had any Hopes of escaping from the Hands of his Enemies, he declares, it is through the Merits of Saints. And in another Piece, he says in express Words, that *'tis impossible for any Sinner to be saved without the Intercession of the holy Virgin*. In another Work, he prays God to forgive those, who say that he denies the Doctrine of the Intercession of Saints, both with respect to the Living, and those that die in Grace. Nor could it be objected to him, that he did not believe Purgatory: He mentions it so frequently in his Writings, that one would think it was his darling Doctrine. In the *Explanation of his Faith*, which is a kind of Sermon, which he had prepared to preach it at Constance, he calls *the sleeping Church*, the Number of the Elect, who are in Purgatory, and may be helped to come out of it, both through the Intercession of the Saints who are in Heaven, and by the Fastings, Alms, and other good Works of the Faithful, who are still upon Earth. He teaches the same Doctrine more than once in his Treatise of Indulgences written in 1412. Nay, he brings in the Doctrine of Purgatory to oppose the wrong Use of Indulgences. As



As for what concerns the *Worship of Images*, though *John Hus* writ a Tract against it, yet he acknowledges in that very Tract, that one may kneel down, put up Prayers, offer Gifts, and light Tapers before the Image of Christ, and before those of any Saint whatsoever, provided it be not done for the sake of the Image, but for the sake of him who is represented by the Image. This Doctrine was the Opinion of the foundest Part of the Church at that Time, and consequently could not be looked upon as an Heresy in *John Hus*. Let us hear upon this Head *John Gerson*, who was certainly one of the most approved Doctors of the XVth Century. He says in his Exposition of the Decalogue, *We don't worship Images, but God, or the Saints whom they represent*. In a Sermon upon the *Nativity*, *Gerson* says again, That "if a Man kneels down before a Crucifix, he does not worship the Wood, that the Cross is made of, but God who is represented upon it; and that the same ought to be said of the Images of Saints. We don't worship the Images, says he; but we honour the Saints. As for the simple and ignorant People, if they worship the Images themselves, they cannot be excused but by Reason of an invincible Ignorance, or because their Intention is to do what the Church does by honouring Images.

*John Hus* was also fully persuaded of the Necessity of Confession, since he confess'd his Sins to a Priest before he died. If he refused to do the same immediately before his Execution, 'tis because he could not do it, but upon a Condition which he could not accept with a good Conscience.

One needs only read his Commentary upon *St. James's Epistle*, to be persuaded that his Doctrine concerning the Merit of good Works was the same with the general Doctrine of that Time. In the Sermon above-mentioned he says, That no Man is rewarded in another Life, but according as he has merited in this Life; and that the State of Pilgrimage is the only State, in which a Man may render himself worthy of Reward.

He did also acknowledge the Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome, as it appears from one of the Articles objected against him, wherein he says the Seven Sacraments are ill administred by a wicked Priest. That Objection was not groundd upon the Number of Sacraments, but upon his say-

ing, That, in order to make them effectual, the good Life of a Priest was more necessary than his Dignity. Nay, he explains this last Article, by saying, as we have seen above, That vicious Ministers are, in the Sight of God, altogether unworthy of Administring the Sacraments. In a Treatise concerning Marriage, which he composd in his Confinement, he acknowledges it to be a Sacrament, and pretends to prove it by the Words of *St. Paul*, who, according to the *Vulgar Latin*, says that Marriage is a great Sacrament. He speaks in the same manner of Orders, Confirmation, and Extreme-Unction, in his Commentary upon *St. James's Epistle*.

I have not observed neither (continues *Mr. Lenfant*) that his Doctrine concerning Tradition differd from that of the most Eminent Doctors of his Time. For in all his Works, he undertakes, as they do, to prove his Assertions by the Scripture and Tradition, that is; by the Authority of Fathers and Councils. And in the Explanation of his Faith, he declares, that he receives all the Opinions of the Holy Doctors, in as much as they explain the Law of *Jesus Christ*; that he has a Veneration for all the Councils, both General and Particular, for the Decrees and Decretals, and all the Laws, Canons, and Constitutions, inas-much as they agree with God's Law explicitly, or implicitly. This was the common Opinion of the Doctors; for they pretended, that Tradition contained nothing contrary to Revelation. 'Tis true, *John Hus* writ a Treatise against Human Traditions; but he did not understand by it, what is commonly called Tradition in the Church of Rome. Let us hear *John Gerson* upon this Head. The Second Degree of Truths, which ought to be believed, consists (says he) in those Truths, which the Church has determined, and received from the Apostles by an uninterrupted Succession, and an undeniable Tradition. *John Hus* never denied this; and therefore by Human Traditions, he only meant several superstitious Ceremonies groundd upon mere Custom; that great Number of Monastick Orders, which brought into Religion a Medley unbecoming its Primitive Simplicity; the exorbitant Wealth and Power of the Popes and Clergy; in a word, all the Abuses which proceeded from their Avarice, Ambition, and Sensuality, and served only to support those Vices. But all the Doctors of that Time, who were for a Reformation, spoke



as plainly as *John Hus* against those Human Inventions. *Henricus de Hassia* complains openly of so many Pictures and Images, with which the Churches are party-coloured; of the great Number of Religious Orders and Monks; of the Multiplication of Saints and Holy Days; of the Introduction of some Apocryphal Books, to the Prejudice of Faith. 'Tis certain that *John Hus* never spoke more boldly against Human Traditions, and the Popes Decretals, than *Gerson* did in many of his Works. If to all this we add the Testimonials of Orthodoxy, which *John Hus* received from the Archbishop of *Prague*, and the Inquisitor of the Faith in *Bohemia*, as well as from the University of *Prague*; there can be no doubt that he believed all the Doctrines, that were then received in the Church of *Rome*, excepting some Articles, which concerned Manners and Ecclesiastical Discipline, rather than Faith. And indeed some Writers of the *Roman Communion*, such as *Florimond de Raymond*, and *Resweide* a Jesuit, acknowledge that he did not depart from the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in any Essential Point.

He had so good an Opinion of his Cause, that he says in one of his Letters, he does not believe his Judges can alledge any thing against him, but the following Articles. First, That he has opposed the Crusade of *John XXIII*. Secondly, That he has officiated all the Time he lay under Excommunication. Thirdly, That he has appealed from the Pope's Judgment. Fourthly, That he has writ a certain Letter, which was read in *Bethlehem-Chapel*. He adds in his 54th Letter, that his saying that Temporal Princes may deprive the Clergy of their Estates, was also looked upon as an Heresy. As for the first Article, which concerns *John Hus's* Books and Sermons against the Crusade published by *John XXIII*. 'tis certain he had on his Side all the Friends of *Ladissaus* and *Gregory XII*. who doubtless did not approve that Crusade no more than *John Hus*, though upon different Principles. *John Hus* did not favour *Gregory XII*. and *Ladissaus*; but because he did not look upon the latter as a professed Heretick, the Bull which *John XXIII*. fulminated against that Prince, appeared to him unjust and barbarous. Besides, he did not believe the Popes had a Right to sow Discord in the World, and to turn all *Christendom* into a Field of Battel, under Pretence of Religion, but at the bot-

tom to satisfy their Ambition and Avarice. Thus *John Hus* was not so much against Indulgences, as against the ill Use, which the Popes and their Ministers made of them, or the Motives and Method of distributing the same. And if any one will take the Pains to compare his Book concerning Indulgences, with what *Gerson* says of them in some of his Works, he will find but little Difference between their Opinions about that Subject.

The other Crime charged upon *John Hus*, was his saying Mass and Preaching all the Time of his Excommunication. 'Tis true, that upon this Head he would have found it a difficult thing to clear himself from Disobedience to his Superiors, especially since he acknowledged still their Authority, having appealed from the Judgment of the Archbishop of *Prague* to *Alexander V*. and then to *John XXIII*. However, let us hear *Gerson* upon Excommunication. He says, That a Sentence of Excommunication ought not to be pronounced, but upon Account of a manifest Disobedience, when a Man does notoriously refuse to hear the Church. From whence it appears, continues he, that if it be impossible for him to obey the Commands of the Church, he is not excommunicated before God, and every such Excommunication is unjust. It is also the Opinion of *Zarabella*, Cardinal of *Florence*, one of the most Eminent Canonists of his Time. *Peter d'Ailly*, Cardinal of *Cambray*, whom we have so often mentioned, is no less positive upon this Subject, since he says, That in Matters of Faith, a Sentence of Excommunication ought not to be pronounced, but against a Man, who has been well instructed in the Truth, and refuses to acknowledge it. 'Tis true it is their Opinion, that though the Excommunication be unjust before God, yet a Man is obliged to undergo it, for the sake of Order, and out of respect for the Church. But they add at the same time, that a Prelate, and even a Pope, may abuse their Power to such a Degree, that it is glorious and meritorious not to obey them; because in this Case the Scandal arising from Disobedience falls upon the Person who is the Author of an unjust Excommunication, and not upon him who refuses to submit to it. If it be feared, says *Gerson*, that weak People, who look upon the Pope as a God, will be offended at it, one must endeavour to set them right in that Matter; and then if they will not acquiesce in it, the Scandal lies only at their Door.



Door. Lastly; he concludes that one must humbly take the most proper Method to persuade the Pope to desist from an unjust Excommunication; but if such a Submission does not succeed, one must put on Constancy and Freedom, and take a generous Resolution. *John Hus* was exactly in all those Circumstances. He could not go to Rome without a manifest Danger of his Life, by reason of the Mortal Enemies he had in Germany, as he himself says in a Letter which he writ to the Pope, and in another which he writ to the Cardinals, desiring to be dispensed from appearing in Person. Nay, the Ancient Author of *John Hus's* Life intimates plainly enough, that he was dispensed from it by that Pope; but Cardinal Colonna, who had been appointed to take Cognizance of that Affair, being resolved to persist in what he had done, suppressed the Dispensation which *John Hus* had obtained. Whereupon the King of Bohemia, and the University of Prague, writ to the Court of Rome, and desired that *John Hus* should be dispensed from appearing there. In the mean time, to shew his Obedience to the Church, he sent his Proxies to the Court of Rome, where they met with a very ill Usage. In short, one needs only read *John Hus's* Apology written in 1412. by *John de Jessenitz*, a Doctor of Canon Law, to be convinced that his Excommunication was neither just nor legal, and that, according to the Canon Law, he was not obliged to submit to it.

This leads us to the Third Crime of *John Hus*, viz. his Appeal from the Pope to Jesus Christ, or the Council. The whole Conduct of the Council, in relation to the Three Popes, is a sufficient Apology for *John Hus* upon this Head. Besides, if according to the constant Doctrine of that Council, the Pope is not Infallible; if he may be tried, and even punished; 'tis plain, one may appeal from his Judgment. Nay, when *Martin V.* pretended after his Election, that no body could lawfully appeal from the Pope's Judgment in Matters of Faith, *John Gerson* writ a Book on purpose to prove the contrary. There was therefore nothing extraordinary nor irregular in *John Hus's* Appeal.

As for the Letter which he writ to his Friends at Prague, before his Departure for the Council, and which was publicly read in Bethlehem-Chapel, and then at Constance,

he often complains that it was falsified by his Enemies; and therefore, in order to judge of that Letter, it would be necessary to know what Alterations were made in it. Here follows the Substance of what was contained in it, according to the Edition of *John Hus's* Works in 1537, and 1558. He intreats his Friends at Prague to continue in the Profession of Truth, and expresses his Grief for not being able to preach the Word of God in that City, and to confute the false Reports spread against him. He informs them that he is going to Constance with a Safe-Conduct. He protests, that if he is condemned by the Council, it will be unjustly, since he has never held nor taught any false Doctrine. He says he is not ignorant, that he shall have at Constance, among the Bishops, Doctors, Secular Princes, and Pharisees, (meaning undoubtedly the Monks) more Enemies, and in a greater Number, than Christ had; that in his Imitation, and with his Assistance, he is resolved to suffer every thing patiently; and that whether he dies at Constance, or returns to Prague, he entirely submits to Providence. He adds, that if he is dismissed, he will come home innocent, that is, without prevaricating against the Truth of the Gospel; and then he will be more able to extirpate the Doctrine of Antichrist. This is a bold Letter; and according to the Principles of the Council, it might appear seditious: 'Tis not therefore surprising, that it should have been alledged against him. But because we know not whether it was printed, such as it was written, or such as it was produced at Constance, we cannot judge of that Piece with any Certainty.

Lastly, *John Hus* believed the Council would prosecute him for having said, that Temporal Princes may lawfully invade the Estates of the Clergy. 'Tis true, he writ a Treatise upon that Subject; and it was occasioned by this Assertion of Wicliffe, That Temporal Lords may deprive those Clergymen of their Estates, who live in any habitual Sin. But it ought to be observed, that in the very Beginning of this Treatise, *John Hus* declares, that it is not his Intention that Secular Princes should invade the Church-Goods at their Pleasure, and by any means whatsoever, nor that they should apply them to such a Use as they think fit. After this Protestation, there is nothing in the whole Treatise,



tise, but what has been advanced by the *Gallican Church*, &c. to maintain the Rights of *Regale*. In the LIVth Letter, *John Hus* alleges an Argument, which the Emperor should have thought unanswerable, to prove that Princes may deprive the Clergy of their Estates. *Intimate*, says he, to the Emperor, that if a Man who maintains this Assertion, is an Heretick, the Emperor himself, and Charles IV. his Father have been great Hereticks, since they have frequently invaded the Church-Goods.

These Five Articles cannot afford a sufficient Reason to burn *John Hus*; and therefore we must look for some other Reasons elsewhere. If all his Books had been known to the Council, such a severe Condemnation would appear less surprising; but 'tis certain they did not see many of them. He desired his Friends to conceal as many as they could get. The Council did not see his *Anatomy of Antichrist*, wherein the Pope and the Church of Rome are all along described with the most frightful Colours, and wherein he inveighs against them with a Fury and Rudeness, that can hardly be excused. 'Tis true, that Work was written during the Schism, and therefore could not give so much Offence, as if it had been written at some other Time, since the most Catholick Doctors did not scruple to call the Antipopes *Antichrist*, and to compare the Church of Rome, as it was then, to the great Whore of the Revelations. However, if the Fathers of the Council had seen that Work, they would doubtless have extracted out of it many scandalous Articles, which might have given a better Colour to their Condemnation. The same ought to be said of his Letters. Had they been made publick, they would have been sufficient to condemn him, even justly, according to the Principles of the Council. He bestows all along, in those Letters, the odious Name of *Antichrist* upon the Pope, the See of Rome, the Roman Church, and the Council. He uses that Council in the most injurious Manner. *I hear frequently the People of Suabia say*, (they are *John Hus's* Words in his XIIth Letter,) *that above Thirty Years will be requisite to expiate the Infamies, which have been committed here by the Council. Most People are scandalized to see so many execrable Things.* In the XIIIth Letter, wherein he mentions the Condemnation of *John XXIII.* he plainly says, the whole Council is guilty of the

main Crime for which that Pope has been condemned, *viz.* Simony, and that it is practiced even at *Constance*. In the XIXth Letter, he enumerates the Errors which the Council was guilty of, such as falsifying the Articles extracted out of his Books, and worshipping a Pope, whom he knew to be a Simoniack, an Heretick, a Murderer, and a Sodomite.

But because neither those Letters, nor many of his Books, and in particular, the *Anatomy of Antichrist*, were known to the Council, they ought not to be reckoned among the Motives of his Condemnation. We must therefore have recourse to some other Reasons. 'Tis certain, that without reckoning those Books, which have been just now mentioned, *John Hus* did very much expose himself, not only by several Pieces that were publick, but also by his Conversations. He inveighed upon all Occasions against the Pope, the Cardinals, Bishops, and Monks, and generally against all the Clergy, upbraiding them in a biting and Satyrical Style with their vast Wealth, Avarice and Ambition, Ignorance, and disorderly Lives. *Hinc illæ Lacrymæ.* The following Lines, taken from an old Manuscript, have been prefixed to *John Hus's* Works: *Whilst John Hus was contented to inveigh against the Vices of the Laity, every body said, he had the Spirit of God; but he began to grow odious, as soon as he attacked the Clergy, because he touched the Sore.* One cannot certainly justify so much Passion and Anger in a Christian, especially in a Priest, who ought to give an Example of Moderation and Submission to his Superiors, even when they make an ill Use of their Power. But abating *John Hus's* Way of expressing himself, his Complaints against the Clergy were not peculiar to him, especially since the Schism; and one needs only read the Works of *Peter d'Ailly* (*Petrus Alliatus*), *Francis Zarabella*, *Theodorick de Niem*, *Nicolas de Clemangis*, *Henricus de Hassia*, *John Gerson*, *Paulus Anglus*, *Theodorick de Vrie*, &c. to find as bold things upon that Head, as in *John Hus's* Books. Nay, to go no farther than *Bohemia*, the Speeches, which *Stephen Paletz*, *Maurice of Prague*, and some other *Bohemian* Doctors, pronounced in a full Council against the Avarice, Ambition, Ignorance, Lewdness, Simony, and all the other Vices of the Clergy, would be as many Apologies for *John Hus*.  
What



What Heresies therefore was that Bohemian Divine guilty of? One of the greatest (continues Mr. Lenfant) is, in my Opinion, his teaching, that the Church of Rome is not the Mother and the Head of the universal Church; that the Pope and the Cardinals are not essential to the Church, and that she might be without them. But this was not a Doctrine unheard of at that time; and it could not appear very strange to a great Part of Christendom, especially since the great Western Schism. Theodorick de Vrie in his History of the Council of Constance, written at that very time, or not long after, advances a Proposition, which contains the whole Doctrine of John Hus concerning the Church. He introduces Jesus Christ speaking to his Church in these Words: *That I may be thy Spouse, 'tis enough if there is one righteous Man upon Earth, though every Body else should be guilty of Heresy; and he says in another Place, that all the righteous and faithful who are in the World, and live a holy Life, are the true Spouse of Christ, though he had no Vicar upon Earth.* John Hus never expressed himself more freely about the Church of Rome, the Pope, and the Cardinals, than Gerson did in his Treatise *de asseribilibitate Papæ ab Ecclesia*, and in another concerning the Reformation of the Church, which he writ not long before the Council. He says among other Things in this last Treatise, "That the universal Church consists of diverse Members, which make but one Body, Greeks, Latins, Barbarians, Men, Women, Peasants, Noblemen, Poor or Rich, provided they believe in Christ. That Christ is the only Head of that Church; and that others, viz. the Pope, the Cardinals and Prelates, the Clergy, Kings and Princes, and the People, are the Members of it, though in a different Degree. That it cannot be said that the Pope is the Head of that Church, but only the Vicar of Jesus Christ, performing his Functions upon Earth, *dum clavibus non erret.* That every Man may be saved in that Church, though there was no Pope in the World, and it were impossible to find one; because the Faith of Jesus Christ is only grounded upon that universal Church, and because she has received the Power of binding and loosing, which Power would be preserved in all the Faithful that are in the World, though there was no Pope. That Infallibility and Indefeasibility belong

to that Church. But there is another particular and private Church, called Apostolical, which is inclosed in the universal Church, and consists of the Pope, Cardinals, Prelates, and the inferior Clergy. It is usual, says he, to call that Church the Roman Church; and 'tis thought the Pope is the Head of it, and that the other Ecclesiasticks are its Members. That Church may err, deceive herself and others, be Heretical and Schismatical, and even fall off entirely; and she has no other Authority, but what she receives from the universal Church, whose Instrument and Minister she is. As for the Popes, here follows what he says of them in the same Treatise. "That it ought to be supposed that all the Constitutions and Laws made in Favour of the Pope, the Cardinals, Prelates, &c. will not turn neither directly nor indirectly, neither in the Whole nor in Part, to the Prejudice or Division of the Church. That if an Hereditary King may be deposed for the good of a Kingdom, much more is it lawful to depose a Pope elected by Cardinals, whose Father and Grandfather were so poor that they could not eat their Belly-full of Beans. That 'tis very hard to see the Son of a Fisherman of Venice in Possession of the Pontificate, to the great Prejudice of the whole Church, and of so many Kings, Princes, and Prelates, and that he should be the Cause of so many Disorders and Scandals. That the Decretals, Clementines, &c. were mere Contrivances of Fraud, Avarice, and Ambition, to support the Papal Authority, which Christ has only conferred for ever upon those, who love God in Truth, and with all their Hearts, &c." This is sufficient to shew that John Hus's Doctrine concerning the Roman Church and the Pope was not different from that of the most Learned Doctors of his time.

Thus, continues the Author, all Things duly considered, I can only find two plausible Reasons for the Condemnation of John Hus. The first is, that he constantly refused to condemn the Opinions of Wicliffe, and represented him as a holy Man upon many Occasions. But he declared to the Council, that he never designed to maintain the Errors of any Body; and as for Wicliffe, that he was ready to subscribe to the Condemnation of his Articles, if they could shew him the Falsity thereof by the Scripture. Besides,



it appears from his Examination, that he was not of *Wicliffe's* Opinion about the Eucharist, and that he only maintained those Articles of that *English* Divine, which concerned the Pope, the Church of *Rome*, Tithes, Indulgences, Ecclesiastical Censures, &c. Now, one may boldly affirm that all the Doctors of that time, who desired a Reformation, and exclaimed against the Tyranny of the Popes, and the disorderly Lives of the Clergy, were as many *Wicliffites* and *Hussites*, and even that the wisest Part of the Council consisted of such Men. The other Reason is, that *John Hus* by his Sermons and Writings, and by his violent and passionate Conduct, had very much contributed to the Troubles of *Bohemia*. But if there was a Necessity to punish those, who had occasioned so many Evils, the Council should have gone back higher than *John Hus*, and made a more general Decision. All the Writers and Orators of that time, not one excepted, did not scruple to ascribe the Cause of Heresies, and in particular of that of *John Hus*, to the scandalous Lives of the Popes, to the Schism, the want of Discipline, and the general Depavation of the Clergy. And therefore, if, according to those Authors, Heresy was the Occasion of the Troubles of *Bohemia*; the Conduct of the Popes, and the disorderly Lives of the Clergy of *Rome* having occasioned Heresy, the Council should have used a general Indulgence or a general Severity.

In all that I have said concerning the Doctrine and Conduct of *John Hus*, my only Design (*says Mr. Lenfant*) was to clear several Things, which have been misrepresented. It appears from this Account that *John Hus* was at a considerable Distance from the Doctrines, which *Luther* preached about a hundred Years after. Nay, he did not go so far as *Wicliffe*, though properly speaking, he was his Martyr, since he took from him all the Principles, which occasioned his Condemnation; and he might doubtless have avoided it, had he been willing to condemn that *English* Divine. 'Tis true one can hardly doubt, that if *John Hus* had lived longer, and more quietly, his Principles would have carried him much farther. The Emperor was aware of it, when he said that in case *John Hus* should retract, he should not be allowed to return into *Bohemia*, nor to preach any where: That Prince foresaw that a Man

of *John Hus's* Character was not like to stop half way. *John Hus* himself sufficiently shews in some of his Letters, that he was not satisfied with the Progress he had made in the Knowledge of the pure Doctrine of the Gospel. In his second Letter, he hopes that if he returns to *Prague*, God will enable him to know better and better the Gospel-Truths. In the XIth Letter, he hopes God will preserve *Bethlehem-Chapel*, and that his Word will be more fruitful by the Ministry of others, than by his own. In the XIIth, he says, that "those who have condemned his Doctrine, will fly away up and down like Butterflies, and that their Statutes will last no longer than Cobwebs". The Council of *Constance*, says he in the XIIIth Letter, will not reach so far as *Bohemia*. I think many Members of that Council will be dead, before my Works can be taken away from you. All those Men being dispersed like Storks, will perceive at the coming of the Winter, what they have done in the Summer. Such Thoughts running continually in his Mind, occurred to his Imagination in his Sleep; and though he did not take his Dreams to be supernatural, as he says in express Words, yet he was fond of them. He dreamed one Night that he had painted Jesus Christ upon the Walls of *Bethlehem-Chapel*, and that his Work had been defaced at the same time, but the next Day many Painters more skilful than he, having drawn several Pictures of Jesus Christ much finer than his, they defied all the Bishops and Priests to deface those Pictures.

When he was obliged to go away from *Prague*, by reason of his Suspension, he writ to his Friends, (alluding to his Name, which signifies a Goose,) that a Goose \* is a tame Creature, which does not fly very high; but that other Birds would fly swift above the Snares of the Enemy. This Passage has in all Probability occasioned a certain Tradition, importing that *John Hus* foretold *Luther's* Reformation in these Words, which he is said to have spoke before his Judges: You roast a Goose to Day; but a Hundred Years hence there will appear a white Swan, whom you will never be able to destroy. This pretended Prophecy seems to have been invented after the Event, to

\* Epist. VI. fol. 96. 2.



make a Prophet of *John Hus*, and to ascribe a divine Mission to *Luther*. The two Relations of *John Hus's* Life and Death, written by his own Disciples and constant Hearers, say nothing of it. Besides, in the Words just now mentioned, he does not speak of a Swan, but of Birds in general, without determining any time. Nay, it will appear from the next Words, that *John Hus* means rather the present time, than the time to come. *Instead of a weak and fearful Goose, God (says he) has sent to Prague Hawks and Eagles, whose Sight is quicker than that of other Birds, and they carry them all away to Jesus Christ.* This is what he says elsewhere in plainer Words. *I hope there will be better Workmen after me, (nay, there are some already,) who will better discover the Malice of Antichrist, and sacrifice their Lives for the Truth of the Gospel.* There is nothing in all this, but what is very natural, and might easily come into the Mind of a Man of *John Hus's* Character, especially considering how Things stood then in *Bohemia*, and in some other Parts of the World.

From what has been said it plainly appears, that if *John Hus* did not go farther, it was not because he thought there was nothing else to do. And therefore, if the Protestants cannot say that he died a Martyr for those Truths, which they profess to believe; they may at least look upon him as an excellent Fore runner of the Reformation. But because Men are not burnt for their inward Sentiments, whatever Projects *John Hus* might have formed, to carry farther the Reformation of the Church of *Rome*, they cannot justify the Council for treating him in such a cruel and barbarous manner. *John Hus*, even by the Confession of his Enemies, equalled and perhaps surpassed the greatest Men of his Time, by his learning and noble Endowments, and by the Regularity of his Life. Any one who reads his Letters, will admire, (notwithstanding the Bitterness of his Style,) the Greatness and Piety of his Sentiments, the Niceness of his Conscience, his Charity towards his Enemies, his Faithfulness and Love for his Friends, his Gratitude towards his Benefactors; but above all, a Steadiness of Soul, attended with an admirable Modesty and Humility. If *John Hus* had writ those Letters in Hopes that they would be made publick, he might be suspected of acting the Part of an Hypocrite to

impose upon the World. But they were written and sent with great Caution to intimate Friends, who could not have published them without exposing him and themselves too, because he spoke of the Popes, and the Church of *Rome*, and even of the Council with an extraordinary Freedom.

Mr. *Lenfant* concludes, That if a modern Writer did not scruple to make an Apology for *John XXIII.* who was accused and partly convicted of the most abominable Crimes, he could do no less, than what he has done, to justify *John Hus*.

*The Readers are doubtless sensible, that I could not have omitted these Reflexions upon John Hus's Trial, without leaving them in the Dark as to his Opinions, which have been misrepresented through the Negligence or Partiality of Historians. The Execution of that Bohemian Doctor has made so great a Noise in the Christian World, and the Church of Rome has been so often upbraided with it, that all the Curious must needs be well pleased to have an exact Account of his Doctrine.*

## II.

QUÆSTIO MEDICA proposita ab ill. ac nob. D. D. JOANNE BAPTISTA GASTALDI, Regis Christianissimi Consiliario, & Medico ordinario, Medicinæ doctore in Avenionensi Academia, & Aggregato Professore primario & Botanico, sub hac verborum serie, *An alimentorum coctio, seu digestio, à fermentatione vel à tritu fiat, &c.* Avenione. MDCCXIII.

That is, A PHYSICAL DISSERTATION upon this Question, Whether Digestion is performed by Fermentation or Trituration, written by JOHN BAPTIST GASTALDI, M. D. Counsellor and Physician in Ordinary to the Most Christi-



an King, and Professor of Physick in the University of Avignon. Avignon: Printed for John Delorme. MDCCXIII. in 12. pagg. 45.

*This Piece will not come to my Hands. Here follows an Account of it, taken from the Journal des Scavans.*

THE Doctrine of Digestion by Trituration came out at a Time when Anatomy was little known: Hence it is, according to some Physicians, that this Doctrine was well approved at first. But many give it a more ancient Original, and pretend that it began in the very time of *Hippocrates*; which is the Reason why some Physicians maintained then, that the Ventricle is only the Receptacle of Meat, which being diluted and bruised in the Mouth, continues to be bruised in the Stomach, and by that means is turned into Chyle; and that Drink, which cannot be bruised by Reason of its Liquidity, goes into the Lungs, and not into the Stomach, where it would rather prevent than promote Trituration. *Hippocrates*, as one may see in his Fourth Book of Diseases, attacked an Opinion so contrary to Reason and Experience; and he informs us that he did it, because that Error had already many Favourers. The Doctrine we speak of, did not hold out long against the Arguments of *Hippocrates*; and the Ruin of such a gross Error was quickly attended with the Down-fall of the System, which had occasioned it. But *Erastistratus* raised it up again; and that System having been supported for some time, fell anew into Oblivion, till some modern Authors endeavoured to retrieve it. Dr. *Gastaldi* answers the chief Arguments alledged by those Authors in Favour of such a System; and to set Things in a better Light, he shews, in the first Place, how Fermentation, according to the Doctrine of Physicians, contributes to the Digestion of Food. Afterwards he mentions the particular Opinion of those, who pretend that Digestion is only performed by the grinding of the Aliments in the Stomach. Lastly, he resolves the Question in the following manner.

The Aliments receive their first Preparation in the Mouth, where they are at first

bruised by the Teeth, and impregnated with the Spittle: But the Spittle being a true Ferment, one may very well believe that some Fermentation must arise from that Mixture. For we ought not to make a great Account of what is said of the Spittle by those who reject Fermentation, viz. That it serves only to dilute Meat, and to moisten the Vessels it is to go through. If this be true, how comes it that Nature, which does nothing in vain, has put into the Spittle a great Number of heterogeneous Particles, since mere Water would have been more proper to produce the Effect we speak of? Besides, 'tis observed, that when the Spittle is very watery, and consequently more able to dilute Food, and to moisten the Passages, Digestion is not so well performed: But the contrary should happen, were it true that moistening and diluting are the only Effects of that Liquor. It must therefore be confessed, that the Spittle affords for the Work of Digestion, something different from a diluting Water; that is, Saline Particles which produce a beginning of Fermentation in the Aliments, whilst they are still in the Mouth, and then a greater Fermentation when they get into the Stomach. And indeed our Food receives so considerable and quick an Alteration in our Stomach, that nothing but such a powerful Agent, as Fermentation, can produce that Effect: For how can the essential Parts of Food be thus divided, but by Fermentation? How can any other Cause, but a Ferment, separate the Principles of a mixed Body in such a manner, that those Principles will have a new Combination, and form a new Compound? Besides, how can any one forbear ascribing to Ferments the several Alterations which the Aliments undergo in the Stomach, since Ferments are to be found in it every where: First, a Spittle which continually falls into it; secondly, a particular Juice, called the stomachal Juice, which is afforded by the Stomach it self; thirdly, some remains of the Food which has been digested; and lastly, the Aliments, which are so full of heterogeneous and fermentative Particles, that they ferment by themselves, even before they get into the Stomach. Let us add the bilious Juice and the pancreatick Juice, which mix together towards the out-let of the Stomach, where they finish the Digestion in the *Duodenum*; and let us acknowledge here the



the Uniformity of Nature, which begins the Work of Digestion in the Mouth by the Help of Fermentation, and goes on with it in the Stomach by the same Help.

These are (says the Author) some of the Reasons, which prove that Digestion is performed by Fermentation. Here follow (continues he) the Arguments alledged by the Followers of *Erasistratus* for Trituration. Three Things, say they, are necessary for the Digestion by Trituration, viz. a Liquor which dilutes Food, a Force that can bruise it, and a Place proper to receive it: Now those Three Things are to be found in us; therefore, say they, the Aliments are digested by Trituration. But this Argument may easily be answered. 1. The great Quantity of the Liquid will rather hinder than help Trituration: Now it cannot be denied, that the Drink and Spittle which go down into the Stomach, are in a very considerable Quantity; and therefore both of them would be an Obstacle to Digestion. 2. The grinding Force of the Stomach, as it has been demonstrated by Dr. Astruc †, a Learned Physician of *Montpellier*, amounts to Three Ounces at most, and those of the Muscles of the *Abdomen* to Four Pounds; and consequently that Force is far from being capable of producing the Trituration ascribed to it. 'Tis true, it has been objected to Dr. Astruc, that in his Computation he takes the lateral Pression, which is a small Matter, for the direct Pression, which is very considerable; but that Objection has not been supported by any Proof. Besides, supposing that Dr. Astruc was mistaken, which is not true, we shall add, that the Action of the Longitudinal Fibres of the Stomach has but a very small Strength to grind the Aliments, since all its Power consists in contracting those Fibres, and bringing their Extremities somewhat nearer; which certainly can hardly contribute to Trituration, especially when there is little Food in the Stomach. Thus Dr. Astruc's Objection, which way soever it be considered, remains in its full Force. The Diaphragm and the Muscles of the *Abdomen*, as we are told by those who assert Trituration, have a great Force to grind

the Aliments; and they say, that were it not for such a Help, Digestion could not be easily explained by Trituration. And yet those Fishes, which have no Diaphragm, and whose Muscles of the *Abdomen*, by reason of their Smallness and Situation, have hardly any Strength, can digest very solid Food. That Force of the Diaphragm, as we are told, is equivalent to the Weight of 248235 Pounds: How then can Trituration be performed, when that Force is wanting?

What we observe in Birds that live upon Grain, and in ruminating Animals, is not more consistent with the System of Trituration. Those Birds that live upon Grain, have Two Stomachs provided with many Sets of Fibres: The First, which goes by the Name of *Crop*, and lies immediately under the Throat, receives the Grain at its coming out of the *Oesophagus*: That Grain finds there a Juice, which begins to dissolve it, and produces the same Effect as a Man's Spittle in his Mouth: Afterwards the Grain being impregnated with that Juice, goes down into the Second Stomach, called *Gizzard*, where by the Help of the first Juice which goes along with it, and of another much stronger still, which it receives from a large Conglomerated Gland lying in the Beginning of that Second Stomach, it is at last perfectly digested. 'Tis true, this Stomach is strengthened by Four Digastrick Muscles, whose Structure, as well as that of the Four Sets of Fibres of which it consists, may very much help that Dissolution; but Nature has been so careful to put strong Ferments into those Stomachs, that it sufficiently appears from thence, that those Ferments are the main Cause of Digestion. The Author exactly shews, how ruminating Animals digest their Food; and what he observes upon this Head, is inconsistent with the Doctrine of Trituration.

We are obliged to conclude for fear of being too prolix. A Modern Author \* has written, that those Physicians who maintain

† See the 1st Volume of these Memoirs, Numb. LXVIII.

\* Dr. Hecquet. See the 1st Volume of these Memoirs, Numb. LXVIII. at the End of the 1st Article. See also Numb. VIII in the same Volume, at the Beginning of the 1st Article.



that Digestion is performed by Fermentation, are raving and mad Men. We leave it to the Impartial Readers, who shall consult this Dissertation, to judge of the Matter.

### III.

*FABULA de Hippocrate, Democriti insaniam medicinam adhibere jussu, ex historia veterum Philosophorum eliminata a C. A. H.*

*This Piece has been communicated to the Authors of the Acta Eruditorum.*

**N**imis credula est mortalitas in historiis antiquis. Sufficit plerisque, rem olim narratam esse. Non expenditur, an res veri habeat speciem, nec quam autor quisque sit fide dignus, inquiritur. Scilicet secure hic dormitur, & ut Taciti verba de mor. Germ. cap. 34. paulum immutata faciam mea, sanctius ac reverentius nobis videtur, de actis veterum credere, quam scire. Philosophorum saltim historiam decebat ab fabulis esse immunem, φιλόμυθος enim non est φιλόσοφος. Verum ista quoque historia tot scatet fabulis, ut vix Hercules par videatur expurgando huic stabulo. Multas tamen jam fabulas hic viderunt & exploserunt feliciora ingenia: plures ostendet cautior posteritas. Liceat mihi jam errorem historicum tollere e vita Democriti, quæ pluribus fœdata fabulis est. Cui enim non dictus est Democritus oculis se privasse? Testantur id monumenta historiae Græcæ, ad quæ provocat Gellius in Nocturnis suis lib. X. cap. 17. testantur alii complures. Sed mera fabula est. Ciceroni jam olim fraus mendacis Græciæ suboluit, Lib. V. de Finibus ita scribenti: Democritus vere falsone dicitur oculis se privasse. Plutarchus libro αὐτοῦ πολυπράγμων plane falsum id esse pronuntiat. Inter recentiores cordatissimus quisque Plutarcho subscribit, Jac. Thomasius in Diss. de nigredine nivis, Tomo II. Observat Halensium inserta, §. 2. p. 329. Jo. Clericus Logic. P. III. cap. 2. §. 8. Dan. Clericus in Historia Medicinæ T. 1. p. 92. Belius in Diction.rio, p. 1030. Unde hæc

fabula sit orta, si ex me quæres, crediderim, Democritum præ senio cæcum factum esse. En occasionem fabulæ! Certe eum ad ultimam pervenisse senectutem, auctores consentiunt. Sed mitto hanc fabulam, progressurus ad aliam, nullo fraudis metu vulgo referri solitam. Audiamus, quæso, eam. Cum externarum rerum incuriosus Democritus in solitudine philosopharetur & humana omnia rideret, Abderitæ eum insaniam correptum esse putarunt. Quare legatum mittunt ad Hippocratem cum litteris, quibus eum rogitant, ut quamprimum adveniat, infelicem curaturus Philosophum. Hippocrates dicto Abderitarum protinus audiens advolat Abderam. Verum nihil insaniam animadvertere licuit in Democrito. Porius Hippocrates, summam ejus sapientiam demiratus, Abderitas docuit, Democritum perspectissime sapere, ipsos vero eo laborare morbo, quo confictari dicant Democritum. Memoratu profecto digna fuit hæc historia, si quidem vera est. Nec credibile, eam fuisse præterituros veteres, in tot monumentis tam crebram tamque honorificam injicientes mentionem Democriti. At vero nec Cicero, nec Gellius, nec Valerius Maximus, nec Aelianus, nec Seneca, nec alii veterum id memoriæ prodiderunt. Hippocrates quoque in tot suis operibus nuspiam ejus rei meminit. Quid? quod Diogenes Laertius, satis diligenter lib. X. historiam Democriti describens, tacet, & dum tacet, clamat una cum ceteris, quos nominavi, hanc esse fabulam. Sola igitur epistolarum Hippocrati vulgo tributarum (quæ exstant in Operibus Hippocratis, & hinc Latine in Stanlejo, p. 889. seqq. & in Thomasi Historia sapientiae & stultitiae T. II. p. 8. seqq. quorum uterque eas agnoscit pro genuinis) fide & auctoritate nititur illa relatio, neque vel Stanlejus vel doctissimus ejus Interpres alium quenquam scriptorem adjunxerunt testem. Nec vero dissimulare fas est, eandem historiam in Sorani Vita Hippocratis legi. En verba ejus Latine reddita: Ab Abderitanis etiam vocatus est (Hippocrates), ut eo se conferret, & Democritum quidem insaniam laborantem curaret, totam vero urbem peste liberaret. Sed constat inter eruditos, autorem hunc Sorani nomen mentiri. Immo eum istis epistolis juniorem esse, vel ex eo facile crediderim, quod addit, Hippocratem ideo quoque arcessitum esse ab Abderitis, ut urbem pestilentia liberaret. Hæc enim de re in memoratis epistolis ne musitat



muffit quidem S. P. Q. Abderitanus; ut adeo hoc novum sit additamentum, receptæ jam fabulæ attextum. Hinc manifestum fit, non alio tibi niti historiam istam, quam fictitiis illis epistolis. Hic mihi necessitatem video impositam probandi, epistolas illas inter falsas merces esse rejiciendas. Ac facile quidem cordato Lectori id probavero. Primum namque Diogenes ille Laertius in Vita Democriti non solum nullam earum facit mentionem, sed etiam eas sua ætate fuisse incognitas, silentio indicat suo, vel, si jam tum existerent, non obscure rejicit. Longam enim scriptorum Democriti recensitionem hisce verbis concludit: *Cetera quæ ad illum (Democritum) quidam referunt, partim ex ejus opusculis decerpta, partim omnino aliena consensu omnium sunt.* Ergo Democriti illa ad Hippocratem epistola: ergo & Hippocratis illa ad Democritum cum ceteris. Deinde & hoc certissimum *ῥοδίας* indicium habeo, quod epistolæ illæ perfectum historiæ ordinem ita sequuntur, ut nullus plane in historia hiatus appareat. Certe nullo modo mihi sit verosimile, tales epistolas vere scriptas fuisse, vel, si vel maxime revera scriptæ fuissent, universas fuisse ad posteritatem servatas. Ne Ciceronis quidem epistolas omnes Tyro, libertus ejus doctissimus, conservare potuit, nec eas, quas vindicavit ab interitu, eo, quo scriptæ fuerant, exhibet ordine. Plinius quoque epistolas suas collegit atque edidit, *non servato temporis ordine*, Lib. I. *epist.* I. Atqui Ciceronis ac Plinii ævo longe major erat hominum curiositas ac studium in talibus conservandis, quam antiquioribus temporibus. Atque hoc argumeneum late patet, & ad alias quoque veteribus tribui solitas epistolas accommodari potest, quarum recensum facit Vir doctissimus, J. A. Fabricius *Bibl. Græc. Lib. II. cap. 10.* quibus addi debent Solomonis ad Vaphrem Ægypti, & Hiramum Tyri Regem epistolæ, quas ex Eusebio nuper inseruit *Codici Pseudopigrapho V. T.* idem Fabricius p. 1020. *seqq.* Dixi modo, non esse credibile, conservatas fuisse omnes illas epistolas, si vel maxime scriptæ fuissent. Jam ostendam, ne id quidem probabile esse, eas omnino scriptas fuisse. Age videamus ipsum ordinem & argumentum earum, de quibus disputamus, epistolarum, quo magis eluceat, incredibile esse, eas illis deberi autoribus, quibus vulgo tribuuntur. Prima Senatus populusq; Abderitarum per legatum mittunt Hippocrati litteras, quibus

eum orant, ut curandi Democriti gratia sine mora ad ipsos veniat. Altera epistola, declamatoriis formulis amplificata, respondet Hippocrates, se celeriter adventurum. Sistamus hic gradum. Quis credere possit, Abderitas tam longam missuros fuisse epistolam? Publice scriptæ epistolæ breviter & cum decenti gravitate voluntatem sive Principis sive Reip. exponunt. Quis porro, si rem secum reputet, sibi persuaderi patiatur, integram aliquam Remp. solenni legatione arcessituram esse Medicum civis vel præstantissimi curandi causa? non id potius fecisse cognatos & amicos Democriti? Ad hæc quis nescit, præsentem virtutem contemni, post fata demum laudari? At in ista epistola tantis ornatur laudibus Democritus, ut majoribus non possit. Hic Democritus vocatur *ætæna gloria illius urbis: timent, ne si Democritus mente motus fuerit, cælum ruat, & Abderitarum Resp. pessundetur.* Altera epistola, nempe responsoria Hippocratis, æque inepta est, & declamatorem manifesto prodit autorem. Quam enim ridiculum est, longam mittere epistolam ad eos, ad quos jam preficisci nulla interposita mora cogitas? quam *ἀπερὸς ὁρῶντων*, in ejus generis epistola multis philosophari, suamque ostentare sapientiam? Sed tanta est festinatio Hippocratis scilicet, ut aliam quoque satis longam scripserit epistolam ad Philopœmenem Abderitam, cujus usus erat hospitio. In hac non jam solum declamitat Hippocrates ille *ῥοδίας*, sed plane vaticinatur. Prædicat enim, fore, ut Democritum satis sanum offendar, & Abderitæ per ignorantiam eum habeant pro insano. Quam hæc abhorrent ab omni veri specie! Sed nondum satis nugarum. Nam quatuor adhuc alias ante scripsit epistolas Hippocrates, quam ad iter destinatum sese accingeret. Prima data est ad Dionysium quendam, quem rogat, ut ipso absente rei familiaris curam gerat, ac maxime uxoris, ne forte in rhorum Hippocratis admittat alios: scilicet nusquam tuta fides. Altera est ad Damagetum, a quo petit, ut navis Rhodi comparandæ curam gerat, qua vehi velit Abderam. Tertia rursus ad Philopœmenem, cui narrat somnium suum de Democrito, & promittit, se prope diem Abderam eam ob rem, cujus causa vocatus erat, venturum esse. Quarta est ad Gratevam, quem rogat, ut herbas varii generis, quibus usus sit ad Democritum curandum, colligat atque ad se mittat. Scilicet



cet hoc est festinare ad egrotum, qui, dum molitur, dum comitur Hippocrates, centies misere perire poterat. Sequitur epistola Hippocratis alia Abderæ scripta ad Damagetum, cui non tam epistolam, quam librum mittit, eique tædiosa copia enarrat statum, in quo deprehenderit Democritum. Non lubet eam sub examen revocare. Illud rogo Lectorem gustu satis acuto præditum, ut attente eam legat. Spondeo, eum judicaturum, & hanc & ceteras epistolas esse subdicias. Adeo declamatorie & scholastice, ne dicam putide, scriptæ sunt omnes: ubique affectata & jējuna in iis apparet philosophia. Agmen harum epistolarum claudunt duæ Democriti & Hippocratis mutuæ, sed quarum autor foricis more suo se prodit indicio. Democritus enim ibi commemorat, se adveniente Hippocrate *de mundi dispositione* scripsisse, item *de polis & astris celestibus*. Contra Hippocrates in longa illa ad Damagetum epistola refert, se deprehendisse Democritum *de insania ejusque causis* scribentem. Nimirum mendacem harum epistolarum autorem decebat esse memorem. Porro Hippocrates in sua ad Democritum epistola meminit, se jam senem esse. Facile autem ex natali Hippocratis, & emortuali Democriti anno colligitur, eo tempore Hippocratem, quo Abderam vocatus esse traditur, vix quinquagesimum vitæ annum superasse. Ex hisce satis, opinor, liquet, epistolas illas esse confictas, nec ullo jure ad Hippocratem & Democritum autores referri. Nec opus est alia circumspicere *videlicet* indicia, cum hæc abunde sufficiant. Quæris, quis igitur architectus earum fuerit? Paucis habeto, Græculum fuisse rhetorem. Solebat enim id hominum genus veterum nomine componere epistolas ad ingenium & eloquentiam ostentandam, eodem modo, quo Livius, Curtius, alique historici narrationibus suis intexunt orationes, haud sane ab iis prolatas, quibus tribuuntur, sed confictas ex ingenio. In scholis, inquit Ionsius *de Script. hist. philos. Lib. III. c. 1. p. 216.* celebriorum rhetorum nomine omnis generis orationes exercitiis gratia conficebantur, quas scholasticas declamationes a veris rhetorum orationibus distinguere, earumque discrimen indicare, Grammaticorum erat, cum non raro ea incautis lectoribus imponerent. Nec vero Græci soli, verum etiam Latini ejusmodi epist. styli exercendi causa contexebant, nec dubitarunt se ipsarum autores profiteri: quemadmodum patet exemplo Joannis Le-

movicensis in præfatione ad epistolas Pharaonis & Josephi a se compositas, apud Fabricium *Cod. pseudopigr. V. T. p. 443.* Hæc de causa pleræque antiquorum epistolæ suspectæ sunt Ionsio *Lib. I. cap. 18. p. 99.* aliisque doctissimis & emunctissimæ naris viris, quos adducit Fabricius *Bibl. Græc. Lib. II. cap. 10. p. 417. extrema, & Lib. I. cap. 35. §. 3. p. 239.* Ceterum has ipsas Hippocratis epistolas subdicium esse foetum, jam agnovit Josephus Scaliger *Epist. 106.* cujus verba relege sis apud Fabricium. Cum igitur fundamentum illius historiæ sit plane fabulosum, ipsam quoque fabulosam esse consequitur. Restat, ut investigemus hujus originem fabulæ. Scilicet, verum est, Democritum civibus suis furere visum esse: Idque Seneca diserte testatur *epist. 79.* Cui opinioni duplicem præbuit occasionem Democritus. Nam & in speluncis ac solitudine vitam agebat, & humana ridebat omnia, id est, omnes homines dicebat stultos esse. Rectius vero sentiebat Hippocrates, qui, Diogene Laertio teste, *Lib. IX. cap. de Melisso,* eum Abderitis commendavit. Nam licet ipse Hippocrates in primo congressu Democritum pro homine mentis impote haberet, postea tamen, quum familiaris cum ipso collocutus est, mirum in modum ejus admiratus est sapientiam, teste Eliano, *Lib. IV. Var. histor. cap. 20.* Habes, Lector, ob oculos fabulæ nostræ cunabula. Cum enim Hippocrates fuerit celeberrimi nominis Medicus, Abderitarumque stultitia vel proverbio celebrata sit, ut ex Cicerone patet, *Lib. IV. ad Attic. epist. 15.* & Martiale *Lib. X. epigr. 25:* item ex priore Pseudo Hippocratis epistola ad Damagetum; hinc lepidi nugivenduli finxerunt, Abderitas, stultissimos scilicet homines, inter alia stultitiæ suæ documenta hoc quoque edidisse, ut publico nomine nuntium miserint ad Hippocratem Medicum, eumque rogarint, ut Democritum stultitia & furore correptum propere sanaret, cum ipsis opus esset helleboro.

## IV.

A DEFENCE of the Answer to  
Mr. WHISTON'S Suspicions,  
and



*and an Answer to the Charge of Forgery against St. Athanasius. In a Letter to Mr. Whiston. By STYAN THILRBY, B. A. Fellow of Jesus-College in Cambridge. Cambridge, printed at the University-Press, for Cornelius Crownfield, Printer to the University. And are to be sold by John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall, London. 1713. in 8vo. pagg. 263.*

**T**HIS is a second Book of Mr. Thirlby against Mr. Whiston in Defence of St. Athanasius. The Author says, *this is likely to be the last time that he shall trouble Mr. Whi-*

*ston, or the World with any Amusements about the Honesty of Athanasius.* I am not surprised at such a Declaration, since Mr. Thirlby acknowledges, that "the Subject of the greatest Part of [this Letter] is dry and unpleasant in its own Nature, so as scarce to admit of any Ornament, or any thing which might be thrown in to enliven a dull Scene." The Author is able to write upon more important Subjects.

I could not give an Account of this Book to the Satisfaction of the Readers, without taking Notice of all the Pieces published by Mr. Whiston and Mr. Thirlby concerning St. Athanasius. The Readers know that the Dispute between those Two Gentlemen runs upon this Question, *viz. Whether St. Athanasius was an Honest Man, or a Knave.*

H A G U E.

**M**R. Maeswick, Rector of the Latin School, is about a New Edition of *Virgil*: It will be attended with *Servius's* Commentary.

L E Y D E N.

**T**HE Impression of the Catalogue of our publick Library is in great Forwardness: It will contain both the Printed and the Manuscript Books. Several Professors take Care of that Edition.

A M S T E R D A M.

**M**R. Le Clerc is writing an Abridgment of Ecclesiastical History for the Three First Ages of Christianity. He will perhaps take in the Fourth Century.

H A L L.

**D**R. Goellicke has undertaken to write an exact History of Physick, both Ancient and Modern, and of the several Parts of that Science. He will give an Account, not only of the Lives and Writings of Physicians, but also of their chief Discoveries, Hy-

potheses, Disputes, &c. He begins with the History of *Anatomy*, which is lately come out; and it will be attended with the History of *Surgery*, *Pharmacy*, *Botanicks*, &c.

*Historia Anatomia nova aequae ac antiquae, Autore Andrea Ottomar. Goellicke, M. D. & in Frederic. Regia P. P. Hala Magdeb. 1713. in 8vo.*

In this Volume, the Author begins with *Hippocrates*; and then proceeds to *Democritus*, *Aristotle*, *Ruffus Ephesus*, *Galen*, and so on to the Modern Anatomists.

L U B E C K.

**T**HE following Book, consisting of ten Sheets in 8vo. has been lately published by an Anonymous Author.

*Brevis Introductio in Notitiam Legum Nauticarum, & Scriptorum Juris Reique maritima. Lubeca. 1713.*

L E I P S I C K.

**M**R. Kettner has published a compleat History of what has been said for or against the Genuineness of the famous Passage relating to the Trinity, in the 1st Epistle of St. John,



St. John, Chap. V. ver. 7. The Author maintains that it is not spurious.

*Historia Dicitur Joannei de sanctissima Trinitate I Joau. V. 7. Autore D. Friderico Ernesto Kestnero. Francofurti & Lipsiæ. 1713. in 4to.*

## J E N A.

**M**R. Richter, a learned young Man, has put out a Specimen of his Critical Remarks upon several Greek and Latin Authors. Dr. Büddens, who has advised him to publish those Observations, has prefixed to them a Preface, wherein he treats of the Usefulness of Critique, and commends the Author.

*Gotefridi Richteri, Bernbacensis, Specimen Observationum Criticarum in varios Autores, Græcos & Latinos. Præfationem præmisit Jo. Franciscus Büddens, SS. Theol. D. & P. P. Jenæ. 1713. in 8vo.*

## W U R T Z B U R G.

**T**Hough the Famous Sanchez seems to have exhausted all the Questions relating to Marriage, Father Kugler a Jesuit has thought fit to publish a large Volume in Folio upon the same Subject, wherein he supplies what has been omitted by others, and rectifies their wrong Notions.

*Tractatus Theologico-Canonicus de Matrimonio, prima sui Parte continens Naturam & Essentiam Contractus maritalis, cum Questionibus in hac materia magis controversis; Parte secunda Matrimonii impedimenta, & de his Questiones accuratius discussas. Autore Patre Joanne Kugler, S. J. Theologo, Universitatis Leopoldinae Wratislaviensis Cancellario, typis datus una cum Opusculo de Sponsalibus utrique parti præfixo. Herbipoli. 1713.*

## I T A L Y.

**T**HE Marquis Maffei has found out in the old Library of Verona, several Ancient and Curious Manuscripts; among which there is a Work of Cassiodorus, never yet published, and entituled, *Complexiones in Epistolis Apostolorum & Apocalypsi.*

Another Learned Italian is preparing for the Press a new Edition of *Tertullian*, that will very much exceed those that have been published hitherto. There will be a great many Emendations made from very ancient Manuscripts. This new Edition will come out with a Commentary of *Guido Panciroli*, (never yet printed,) upon all the Books of *Tertullian*. It has been found in the Library of a Monastery at Reggio. The Manuscript is very fairly written, and was revised a second time by *Panciroli* himself.

## P A R I S.

**F**ather Le Long, a Priest of the Oratory, designs to publish a Bibliotheque of the Historians of France, containing the Civil and Ecclesiastical History of that Kingdom, and a General and Particular History of Provinces, Cities, Families, and Academies, whether they be Printed, or only Manuscript. He has perused the most considerable Libraries of Paris, which have been of great Use to him; but to make his Work, which is already in great Forwardness, more compleat, he desires the Learned and the Curious, who have any valuable Pieces of that Kind, to send him the Titles, and to set down exactly the Names of the Authors, and the Dates of Histories, that is, when they begin, and when they end.

*The Index will come out a Fortnight hence.*

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**HES E Memoirs may be had of the Booksellers of London and Westminster.

They are also to be had of Mrs. Dodd and Mrs. Bolter near Temple-Bar; of Mrs. Bond, and Mrs. Bolter at Charing-cross; and at Mr. Dawson's (where the Author lives) in Hunt's-Court, in St. Martin's Lane, near the Church.

L O N D O N: Printed: And Sold by J. Roberts near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-Lane. (Price 6 d.)







